



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Dr. Miller has pointed out that each MS. is the work of several copyists, who wrote in turn. There is abundant internal evidence, too, that the translation itself is the work of more than one hand; for in many places it is quite free and idiomatic, and in other passages it is so oppressively literal as hardly to be English at all. None but the veriest tyro in Latin could have blundered so hopelessly in rendering the heading of Chap. 9 of Book i.; and with the translation of *viginti et octo*, already given, we may compare (p. 252, l. 9) *per novendecim annos=anes wonðe twentig wintra* [MS. B. has *an læs þe twentig*]; (238, 2) *undesexaginta=anes wonþe syxtig*; (386, 25) *decem et novem annis=anes wonþe twentig wintra*. Possibly herein lies the reason why the name of no one man is mentioned in the text as the translator.

While Dr. Miller comes to us as a man with a theory—for which, indeed, he contends manfully—to his lasting credit be it repeated that he has examined this question of authorship in a spirit of the utmost fairness and candor, and, though his own convictions seem firmly rooted, he does not offensively obtrude them upon his readers. It would be interesting to have more from him upon the same subject. Dr. Schipper, too, unless he has given up his study of the Old English Bede, doubtless has much to say that scholars would be glad to read.

Much time and great labor have been expended in determining the Old-English text.

"T. was selected as the basis, and its defects supplemented from B. as belonging to the same recension. The text was completed and written out twice. . . . But after repeated collations and careful study of the MSS., it became evident that Bede was an Anglian and not a West-Saxon work, and that the first necessity was to exhibit a text representing as far as possible the Anglian archetype. This led me to discard B., and adopt a 'contamination' of texts founded on T. C. O. Ca. in order of preference."

Dr. Miller rejects MS. B., for reasons already given, and also Zupitza's leaves from MS. Cott. Dom. A. ix., though he gives numerous variants from B. and one (104, 12) from Z.

"T. has been collated twice throughout. O. has been collated throughout, and twice in those portions used to supplement T. B. has been collated throughout, and twice at the

beginning and end where T. is defective. Smith and Wheelock were collated and the resulting text collated throughout with the MS. Ca. The fragments of C. have been in part collated twice."

Surely no one will complain of lack of industry on the part of the editor; and, however much we might desire a text all from one MS., and, therefore, representing one age and one locality, few will be found who can read Dr. Miller's book and not applaud his judgment in piecing out his text from MSS. representing as nearly as possible the form in which it was first written. The book would have been better adapted to students' use if he had given marginal notes indicating the point where the text passes from one MS. to another, instead of trusting us to foot-notes and the table on p. xxii.

Of the translation little need be said except that it is generally good English, and, therefore, while the more interesting to the general reader into whose hands it may fall, it is so free as to be a little disappointing to the specialist who would have Dr. Miller's views on certain points of syntax. Such an investigator would probably prefer a rendering more like that of Thomson, Miller's only predecessor as a translator, in the 'Whole Works of King Alfred the Great.' In some places, too, Dr. Miller seems to have leaned rather heavily on the Latin text. Thus, on pp. 8-9, "*Ðætte se ylca biscop for ðam intingan untrumnyse feria gehæfd*," appears as "That the same bishop was detained there from illness," where there is apparent the influence of the corresponding Latin, "*Ut idem causa infirmitatis ibidem detentus*."

There are a few misprints. *Abysgad* appears as *absgyad* (48, 11); *semninga* as *semniga* (178, 25), and probably *Brotene* (12, 5) is for *Breotene*.

J. W. PEARCE.

Tulane University of Louisiana.

Selections from Heine's Poems. Edited, with Notes, by HORATIO STEVENS WHITE, Professor of the German Language and Literature in Cornell University. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers. 1890. 12mo, v, 220 pp.

PROFESSOR WHITE'S recent contribution to

class-room material for the study of German literature might well be chosen as an index of the advance which modern language study has made, both as regards scope and critical character, within the past decade. Not until very recently have American editors ventured to produce for use in advanced classes anything beside masterpieces of writers of the first order. With the limited time accorded to the department, there was scarcely a demand for anything else. The increased recognition that modern literatures have lately been acquiring in our highest institutions has rendered possible a more liberal aim.

The work before us is an attempt to present with some degree of fulness what is characteristic in the poetic activity of a notable author of secondary rank, employing his writings themselves as indices of the various aspects of his extraordinary personality. The body of the work consists of one hundred and sixty-six pages of selections, one hundred and fifty-six numbers, of which the 'Buch der Lieder' furnishes nearly one half (seventy-five), 'Neue Gedichte' twenty-eight, 'Aus Deutschland' eleven, the "Romancero" nineteen, and "Letzte Gedichte" twenty-three. Some of the popular favorites are missing, but in general the choice of material will be approved. Certainly the editor has attained his stated purpose "to present only those poems to which one might wish or be willing to recur." Nothing formally objectionable finds place in the collection. The attitude of the editor towards his author as set forth in the preface is strictly judicial, and at the same time calculated to reassure any timid souls who might doubt that Heine is a wholesome author for extended study.

If now we examine Professor White's literary and critical contribution to the work, we find another source of congratulation in the contrast it offers to the method of the older and not yet extinct generation of annotators. Fruitful scholarship, and especially literary sense,—not the juiceless reproduction of facts,—marks every page; in the terse preface, in the longer "introductory note," which introduces the bibliography of Heine in German, French and English; in the remarks upon the several volumes from which the given poems are selected, and finally in the special notes to the

individual selections. The quality and purpose of these textual notes may be judged from the fact that, of the fifty that accompany the seventy-six selections, from the "Buch der Lieder," only twenty are purely explanatory, while more than half the remaining literary notes are citations of similar themes or thoughts in other poets, national and otherwise. Thus on the 'Lorelei':

"No. 37 is not a legend of long ago, but dates from a ballad of Clemens Brentano in 1802. The same subject was then treated by other poets until finally Heine entered into their various labors, and with a touch of true genius gave to the tale its imperishable form. (Details in S. [Strodtmann] i, 362, 696, 7). A charming rendering in Scotch dialect is found in Macmillan's Magazine, May 1872, p. 24"; and then follow two verses of this version.

Again in the note to No. 156, 'Der Scheiden-de,' the Odyssey xi, 488-491, is cited from Bryant's translation, reference is made to Ecclesiastes ix, 4., and the student is invited to "compare this poem with No. 130 ('Sie erlischt') and both with Voltaire's 'Adieux à Vie' (1778), written in the last year of his life," from which several lines are quoted. Surely literary culture is fostered by editing of this sort. "The Empire of letters" assumes a fuller meaning to one introduced to a foreign poet in this manner.

The appendix, which presents linguistic, syntactical and metrical characteristics, not merely of the poems in this collection, but all Heine's verse, deserves more than passing mention. Beyond its value for reference, it offers a suggestion of how certain authors may be studied by the more serious students in the college *seminar*. Under its four rubrics are assembled:

1. Antiquated, obsolescent or unusual words or forms.
2. Grammatical irregularities.
3. Long or unusual compounds or derivatives.
4. Faulty, dialectic and curious rimes in Heine's verse, alliteration, etc.

To follow through an author's writings with mind alert to collect such facts as are collated in these categories, is a work which might be assigned to as many students, and one which could hardly fail, under the supervision of an efficient leader, to inculcate a sense of the

meaning of "painstaking scholarship." At the same time, we thank Professor White for collecting all such material relating to his selections by itself, rather than involving it with his literary notes, to the detriment of their cultural value, for it may as well be recognized that these details have no especial attractiveness in college classes to any but the more serious students.

As a whole the work may be taken as an exposition in concrete form of Professor White's views as set forth in his paper before the *Modern Language Association of America*, in 1887 (see MOD. LANG. NOTES for June, 1888), and in particular of its closing paragraphs.

CHARLES E. FAY.

Tufts College.

ROMANCE ETYMOLOGY.

Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch von GUSTAV KÖRTING. Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh. 1891. 4to, pp. vi, 414.

THE recent completion of what may be regarded as a first draft of this laborious and useful work, marks a decided advance on all its predecessors in the field of Romance etymology. Since the unheralded appearance of the first sheets, not many months ago, the successive instalments have followed each other with unexampled rapidity, until we have now before us not only the entire vocabulary, but also a full complement of indexes, together with an appendix of additions and corrections.

The all-important 'Etymologisches Wörterbuch' of Diez was as unpractical and inconvenient in the disposition of its rich array of materials (I say *was*, since it is now once for all superseded, for practical ease of reference, by the new 'Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch' of Körting) as it was, in the main, sound and scholarly in its presentation of facts and deduction of conclusions; nor could even the importunity of friends and colleagues of the author prevail upon him to depart, in later editions, from a plan of arrangement entailing annoyance as well as loss of time on those who had occasion to consult its learned pages. Indeed, so intricate was the process of search

for a fugitive vocable in these etymological preserves, that in attempting to follow up the clue one might well have been reminded of the familiar yet tantalizing injunction: "First catch your hare." Worst of all, it was only after patient quest under various rubrics that the student could discover whether any given word was even treated of at all, and it was not until the publication of Jarnik's complete index to Diez—of which a second, improved edition appeared shortly before the first instalment of Körting—that scholars felt themselves possessed of a ready and infallible key to all the treasures of the work.

The plan of Körting's dictionary, on the contrary, is a happy innovation. For the primary idea of it, apparently, and for a collection of highly important material, he is indebted to Gröber's articles in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, entitled "Vulgärlateinische Substrata romanischer Wörter," while the bulk of the new dictionary is furnished by a justifiable appropriation of the entire body of Diez's results, so far as these continue to stand the scientific tests of recent years. At the head of each article is set, in bold-face type, the Latin (or other) etymon of the Romance word or groups of words. Each article, moreover, is numbered, a device which greatly promotes ease and accuracy of cross-reference and of index-making. A peculiar merit of the plan is that all categories of words are ranged under one general vocabulary, thus saving a world of trouble in the everyday manipulation of the book.¹

There is, however, lacking in the vocabulary

¹ This—the one-vocabulary—feature of the work has been made the occasion of criticism in a recent notice (*Romania* xix, 637-38): "N'aurait-il pas mieux valu faire pour chacune des langues non latines (sauf quand les mots qui en viennent avaient passé au latin avant la chute de l'Empire) un lexique à part, comme l'a fait M. Jarnik dans ses index de Diez?" By no means. Make, in addition to a complete general index to your one all-inclusive vocabulary, as many special indexes as may be called for; but let the multiplying of vocabularies in such a work as this be forevermore tabooed. Incredible as it may sound to those who have never been annoyed by it, the *Table générale* to the first ten volumes of the *Romania* consists of no less than eight separate reference vocabularies, and to assist in turning to any desired one of these there is neither a page-reference in the table of contents, nor even—what is still more aggravating—an appropriate running-title at the head of the pages. It would be curious to know whether the compiler of the *Table générale* is also the author of the *Romania* critique on Körting's dictionary. In any case, the *Table générale* to the second ten volumes will soon be due, and it is sincerely to be hoped, that if the multiple-vocabulary system is to be retained in the compilation of it, there will at least be added a table of contents with page-references, and with running-titles through the body of the index.